

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated July 21, 2004.

Responsive to the paragraph entitled **Information Disclosure Statement** on page 2 of the aforementioned Office Action, in compliance with 37 CFR §1.98(b), applicant submits herein copies of Korean Patent Applications nos. 10-0287540, 2000-0066245 and 20-0273026 listed on the Form 1449 submitted with the instant application filing, together with their English translations.

The applicant has made minor changes to the specification and to the drawings, for which the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's approval.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as set forth beginning at the middle of page 2 of the Office Action. Claims 7, 8, 13, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as set forth at the top of page 3 of the Office Action. Reconsideration of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 is requested in view of the amendments to the claims herein, which are respectfully submitted to have noted the Examiner's various points and to have responded thereto in a manner which obviates the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Initially relative to the rejection of claim 1 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, reconsideration and withdrawal of that rejection is requested in view of the following comments. The Office Action contends that "the specification and drawings teach that the first and second holes are located adjacent, not above, the first and second holes." The applicant does not understand this comment. Claim 1 does not recite that the first and second holes are located "above" the first and second holes. Rather, claim 1 recites that the first and second holes are located above "a rotation path of the numeral wheel". Support for this recitation can be found in the sentence which bridges pages 8 and 9 of the instant specification. An example of these first and second holes is shown in Figure 3A, in which the holes are identified by reference numerals 138a and 138b. See page 16, lines 1-12. Therefore, the applicant requests withdrawal, or at least clarification, of the objection under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112.

The rejection of claims 7, 8, 13, 17 and 18 has been dealt with by amendment, and therefore withdrawal of the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 is also requested.

The substantive rejection of claims 2 and 19 on prior art has been overcome through the incorporation into claim 2 of the subject matter of allowable claim 13. As such, it is believed that all of the claims in the application are in compliance of both sections of 35 U.S.C. §112, as well as in compliance with the substantive requirements for novelty and unobviousness under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on October 18, 2004:

MAX MOSKOWITZ

Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

Signature

October 18, 2004

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

MAX MOSKOWITZ

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

**AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS**

Figs. 1A and 1B have been amended. The attached sheets of formal drawings replaces the original sheets including Figs. 1A and 1B.